

REMARKS

Claims 10, 11, 33-41 and 45-48 are amended. No claims are added or cancelled. Hence, Claims 10, 11, 14-16 and 33-48 are pending in the application.

I. ISSUES RELATED TO CITED REFERENCES

A. 35 U.S.C. 102(b) - *MONTAGUE*

Claims 10, 11, 33-41 and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Montague et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,761,669 (hereafter "*Montague*"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 33

Claim 33 is directed to a method of comparing access control lists to configure a security policy on a network. Claim 1 recites “subtracting a particular access control entry from another access control entry, wherein both the particular access control entry and said another control entry are two access control entries of multiple first access control entries and wherein the first access control entries, including the particular access control entry and said another access control entry, are all of access control entries as specified in a first access control list.” Claim 1 also recites “identifying one or more first sub-entries in the first access control list, wherein the one or more first sub-entries include each of overlapping sections and non-overlapping sections of all of the first access control entries and wherein at least one of the one or more first sub-entries is derived from results of subtracting the particular access control entry from said another access control entry.” Claim 1 further recites “programmatically determining whether the first access control list is functionally equivalent to a second access control list by determining whether each of the first sub-entries in the first access control list is contained by one or more

entries of multiple second access control entries in the second access control list.” At least these features are not disclosed in *Montague*.

The Office Action cites *Montague* at col. 15 lines 28-52 as disclosing programmatically determining whether the first access control list is functionally equivalent to a second access control list by determining whether each of the first sub-entries in the first access control list is contained by one or more entries of multiple second access control entries in the second access control list, as featured in Claim 1. This is a mischaracterization of *Montague* and Claim 1.

In *Montague*, an access control request may be used to modify access control entries for an entity (such as a file) in an ACL (col. 15 lines 28-52; FIG. 11). Specifically, the access control request identifies a user or group account. One or more access control entries may be located in the ACL based on the user or group account specified in the access control request. The located access control entries may then be modified based on the access control request (e.g., a “Read” permission may be modified into a “Read/Write” permission). Of the two actions as described in the cited portion of *Montague*, searching and modifying, only the former (i.e., searching) involves a determination of whether the access control list of *Montague* contains access control entries for a user or group account specified in the access control request of *Montague*. However, this searching action of *Montague* determines only whether a user or group account is contained by entries in the access control list, not whether each of sub-entries in the access control request is contained in the access control list, where the sub-entries include each of overlapping sections and non-overlapping sections of all of access control entries in the access control request.

Indeed, the access control information in the access control request of *Montague* cannot be likened to first sub-entries of Claim 1 in the first place. As recited in Claim 1, at least one of

the one or more first sub-entries is derived from results of subtracting the particular access control entry from another access control entry, where both the particular access control entry and said another access control entry are included in the access control entries of the first access control list. *Montague* is devoid of any disclosure of any (or at least one) sub-entry that is derived from results of subtracting an access control entry from another access control entry in the same list.

For these reasons, Claim 33 is patentable over *Montague*.

Claims 36, 37 and 45

Claims 36, 37 and 45 are independent claims that are similar in scope and include all features of method claim 33. Claims 36, 37 and 45 are patentable over *Montague* for at least the same reasons as those given above in connection with claim 33.

Claims 10, 11, 34-41 and 46-48

Claims 10, 11, 34-41 and 46-48 depend from, and hence, incorporate all of the features of claim 33, 36, 37 or 45 that are discussed above. These claims also recite further features that independently render them patentable over *Montague*. However, because *Montague* lacks the features discussed above for claims 33, 36, 37, or 45, claims 10, 11, 34-41 and 46-48 necessarily are patentable over *Montague* for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 33, 36, 37 or 45.

B. 35 U.S.C. 103(a) – MONTAGUE and BRAWN

Claims 14 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Montague* as applied to claims 33, 37 and 45 and further in view of Brawn et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,020,718 B2 (hereafter "*Brawn*"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 14 and 42 depend from, and hence, incorporate all of the features of claim 33, 36, 37 or 45. Claims 14 and 42 also recite further features that independently render them patentable over *Montague*. *Brawn* fails to disclose any of the features of claim 33, 36, 37 or 45 previously discussed and therefore *Brown* does not cure the deficiencies of *Montague* that are described above, and any combination of *Brown* and *Montague* necessarily cannot provide the complete subject matter of claims 14 and 42. Claims 14 and 42 are patentable over *Montague* and *Brawn* for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 33, 36, 37 or 45.

C. 35 U.S.C. 103(a) – MONTAGUE and MATE

Claims 15 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Montague* as applied to claims 33, 37 and 45, and further in view of Mate et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,028,098 B2 (hereinafter "*Mate*"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 15 and 43 depend from and incorporate all of the features of claim 33, 36, 37 or 45. Claims 15 and 43 also recite further features that render them patentable over *Montague*. *Mate* fails to disclose any of the features of claim 33, 36, 37 or 45 previously discussed, and therefore *Mate* does not cure the deficiencies of *Montague* that are described above, and any combination of *Mate* and *Montague* necessarily cannot provide the complete subject matter of claims 15 and 43. Claims 15 and 43 are patentable over *Montague* and *Mate* for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 33, 36, 37 or 45.

D. 35 U.S.C. 103(a) – MONTAGUE and BANGINWAR

Claims 16 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Montague* as applied to claims 33, 37 and 45, and further in view of Banginwar, U.S. Patent No. 6,611,863 (hereinafter "*Banginwar*"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16 and 44 depend from, and hence, incorporate all of the features of claim 33, 36, 37 or 45. Claims 16 and 44 also recite further features that render them patentable over *Montague*. *Banginwar* fails to disclose any of the features of claim 33, 36, 37 or 45 previously discussed and therefore *Banginwar* does not cure the deficiencies of *Montague* that are described above, and any combination of *Banginwar* and *Montague* necessarily cannot provide the complete subject matter of claims 16 and 44. Claims 16 and 44 are patentable over *Montague* and *Banginwar* for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 33, 36, 37 or 45.

II. CONCLUSIONS

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: July 29, 2008

/ZhichongGu#56543/

Zhichong Gu

Reg. No. 56,543

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1236
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076